



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,597	09/25/2003	Alexa L. Martinez	2057.0040002	1312

26111 7590 10/10/2006

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

GUPTA, ANISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TH

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/669,597	Applicant(s) MARTINEZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Anish Gupta	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-38, 59-96, drawn to polypeptide-PEG conjugate, classified in class 530, subclass 300+.
- II. Claims 39-53, drawn to method of preventing or treating a physical disorder, classified in class 514, subclass 2+.
- III. Claims 39-53, drawn to diagnosing a physical disorder, classified in class 436, subclass 1+.
- IV. Claims 54-58, drawn to a method of making a PEG-polypeptide conjugate, classified in class 530, subclass 344.
- V. Claims 97-100, drawn to a method of making a PEG-polypeptide conjugate, classified in class 530, subclass 344.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions of Group I and Group V are independent and distinct in that each group is structurally distinct from one another. Polypeptide are characterized by the presence of amino acids and amide bonds. However, liposomes spherical vesicle with a membrane composed of a phospholipid bilayer used to deliver drugs or genetic material into a cell. The PEG-polypeptide conjugate is distinct from a PEG-liposome conjugate. Given the structural distinction, the search for each conjugate is also distinct.

Inventions Group I and Group II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the

Art Unit: 1654

process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the disease listed in the claimed invention can be achieved using native polypeptide or non polypeptide compounds. For example, HIV can be treated with AZT. Thus, the products and the methods are distinct.

Inventions Group I and Group IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the method of Group IV can be utilized to make PEG-liposome conjugates. These conjugates are distinct from polypeptides for the reasons set forth above.

The method of Group II and Group III are independent and distinct since each method involves different method steps and different end points. A method for diagnosing does not involve a treatment regiment. Further, a method of treatment involves some level of amelioration of the disease or disorder, which is not present in the method of diagnosing. Thus, the methods are independent and distinct from each other.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions

Art Unit: 1654

require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

For Group I-II a conjugate comprising one or more bioactive components attached to at least on polyalkylene glycol. The species are independent or distinct because the bioactive components include peptide, proteins, glycoprotein hormones and the polyalkylene glycol in the alkyl chain. All of the variables are structurally distinct from one another and would require separate searches. Applicants are requested to elect a single disclosed conjugate that comprises a specific bioactive agent and specific glycol moiety. It is noted that the bioactive agents have been broken down into proteins, peptide, glycoprotein hormones etc... An election to just the protein or peptide (generic) will not be a sufficient election. Applicants are requested to elect a single disclosed protein or peptide such as those recited in claim 29-30. If Applicants elect a generic, the election will be held as not fully responsive.

If Applicants elect the method of treating/ preventing or diagnosing, the in addition to a specific compound, Applicants are requested to elect a single disclosed disorder to be treated/ prevented or diagnosed.

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 1-100 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).


Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Gupta whose telephone number is (571)272-0965. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can normally be reached on (571) 272-0562. The fax phone number of this group is (571)-273-8300.

 10/2/02
Anish Gupta
Patent Examiner